

**BUDGET COMMITTEE  
of the  
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE  
Minutes**

A regular meeting of the Budget Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislative Building, Veterans Highway, Smithtown, New York on Tuesday, October 1, 2002.

**Members Present:**

Legislator Michael Caracciolo - Chairman  
Legislator David Bishop - Vice-Chairman  
Legislator Andrew Crecca  
Legislator Jon Cooper

**Also In Attendance:**

Paul Sabatino II - Counsel to the Legislature  
Ken Knappe - County Exec's Budget Office  
Fred Pollert - Director of the Budget Review Office  
Bill Faulk - County Exec's Office  
All other interested parties

**Minutes Taken By:**

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

1

---

(\*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:00 P.M.\*)

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Could everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance to be led by Legislator Cooper.

**SALUTATION**

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

Before we get to the agenda and give Legislator Crecca an opportunity to join us, Ken, could you come up?

**LEG. BISHOP:**

Where's your consultant?

**MR. KNAPPE:**

I don't have a consultant.

**LEG. BISHOP:**

Let the record show I made the Clerk of the Legislature laugh.

**CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:**

We will plenty of opportunity in three weeks when the committees meet to review the Operating Budget, but one of the issues that I read in the press that has caused some interest and on the part of some concern is that the forecast for sales tax collections relating to the clothing and footwear exemption perhaps seems to be very -- very rosey, good way to put it, Dave. So could you share with us the source of that information that's included in the budget presentation.

**MR. KNAPPE:**

Unfortunately I'm not able to go into that much detail, but I do know

that the former Budget Director, Mr. Bortzfield, the new Budget Director and Thomas Conscenti, who we have used as a sales tax projection consultant economist, as well as consultation with Budget Review Office came up with those figures that I included in the County Executive's Fiscal Impact Statement for that resolution. It's not necessarily pie in the sky numbers, but it was pretty much done in consultation with many different people that I just mentioned as far as where the numbers came from. I don't know what Budget Review has supplied with the Legislature yet regarding that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay. I know -- I know there was some discussion on this in Finance this morning, I understand there was some type of handout provided, I don't know what the source was, but perhaps --

LEG. CRECCA:

It's the sales tax compliance order, that's what that was.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

That's not the document then. Fred, we're having a brief conversation with regard to the projected sales tax on clothing and footwear, if that would be repealed, there appears to be a rosy projection as to what that generates on an annualized basis. Could you share with us any information along those lines?

2

---

MR. POLLERT:

The sales tax on clothing forecasts were derived on the Budget Review Office's part from information that was provided by vendors to the State of New York. When New York State provided municipalities with the option to sunset the sales tax on clothing, the counties became responsible for the quarter cent portion of the sales tax that the MTA has on taxable sales. So if local governments decided to exempt sales tax on clothing, we had to make the MTA whole. The only way to make the MTA whole is the State of New York required vendors to report to them what sales were that were nontaxable on clothing less than \$110, and then those numbers were used by the State of New York to calculate the County's liability to make the MTA whole. Those numbers are reported on a quarterly basis to the State of New York. We get that information on a quarterly basis from the State of New York, and based upon in a data, a straight forecast would indicate that the reimposition of the sales tax from March 2003 through the end of the year would generate in the neighborhood of 55 to \$58 million. The County Executive has estimated that the sales tax would generate \$58.2 million, that's slightly higher than our forecast. Our forecasts take into account that once you announce that clothing sales less than \$110 would become taxable, the consumers may go out to purchase those items in advance. So currently our forecasts are in the neighborhood of about \$55 million, that again is based upon numbers that have been reported to the State of New York.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

I guess the question becomes are those numbers reliable?

MR. POLLERT:

It's a good question. Clearly there's no penalty if a vendor misreports by either inflating or deflating the amount of sales to the State of New York. It's the best data that we have.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

On the other hand, if I might interject, given the rational that the state uses to collect that quarter percent of the sales tax for MTA purposes, it works to the state's benefit if the counties that adopted the repeal of sales tax on clothing, I think there are 14 in the State, -- well, not all 14 would be subject to the MTA, because it's only nine downstate counties, but within the downstate region, those states -- those counties like Suffolk that would be subject to that methodology could, in fact, being paying more for MTA reimbursement then we really should.

MR. POLLERT:

That's absolutely correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

So, I mean, that's very -- that's a concern. I mean, how do we put in place a check and balance to make sure that we're not overpaying a reimbursement that we have a legal obligation for, the MTA, and on the other hand, we are not going to rely on a forecast that based on its very source would not appear to be reliable at all.

MR. POLLERT:

The Budget Review Office has over the last number of years gone to New

3

---

York State Sales Tax with a variety of questions with respect to how sales tax is remitted to Suffolk County. The sales tax group has an on-site outside auditor which reviews their operations and certifies their operations on a monthly basis. The bulk of the vendors are large filers with respect to clothing, they are all computerized, I would imagine that they are going to accurately report to the State of New York. I can't see any reason that a Macys or a Sears or, you know, a K-Mart would not properly report data to the State of New York. The noise would really come with the smaller filers which report on a monthly basis. They shouldn't be large enough that they could introduce a tremendous amount of noise. But last year Robert Lipp and Ken Weiss went to Albany to talk with New York State Sales Tax as well as representatives of the County Comptrollers Office and the long and the short of it is they monitor their own books and they don't make the books available to subjurisdictions to monitor what's going on. The accounts are certified by a large accounting firm who monitors what's going on a daily basis.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Does the state Comptroller look at those -- those books?

MR. POLLERT:

That's part of the State Comptrollers Office.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Can we contact them to see if they've examined this area?

MR. POLLERT:

Because it's part of the State Comptrollers Office I would imagine that they're going to say that there are no problems. And to the best of my knowledge, they appear to have a good accounting methodology because they do do reconciliations on a regular basis. And when questioned, they do have explanations on why they are doing reconciliations going back two or three or four quarters.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Do you know if Orange County is one of the 14 counties that exempted the footwear -- clothing or footwear?

MR. POLLERT:

I don't know offhand. I do have a map in my office, I just don't know --

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

All right. If you could provide that for me before you leave -- we leave today, I would appreciate that. Because I would think that if we checked with some other municipalities around the state to see how -- what treatment they have received with regard to these numbers, maybe we could discern something from that as to how reliable they are. Because clearly, if we go with those projections and they don't materialize, then a year from now we'll be sitting through the next budget process scratching our heads as to why weren't these, you know, sales taxes generated. So we have to be very careful in my view that we use reliable data based on a sound, you know, method. And right now I'm not comfortable that the method is so sound. I look forward to that map, and perhaps you and I could talk further about contacting

4

---

some of the other counties to see if they agree or disagree with -- with this methodology. How long has this methodology been in place, and did we use this methodology last -- not last year, but the last time we adopted a budget with -- before the repeal?

MR. POLLERT:

No. At that point in time the methodology was not in place. The methodology has only been in place from the time that the counties opted into the exemption on sales tax on clothing. The methodology which was used prior to that was looking at clothing sales in the aggregate and then making assumptions on the total dollar amount, which was less than \$110.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

How reliable or how accurate was that forecasting method?

MR. POLLERT:

It was -- well, the validation of the accuracy of the forecasting method was validated by what was reported to the State of New York as exempt sales. We were extremely pleased with your forecast for the first two years after the forecast was made because it was right on track with what had been forecasted. It was only --

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Which was about 35 million, as I recall.

MR. POLLERT:

That's correct. The amount of sales tax only started to accelerate based upon what was reported relatively recently within the last year and a half or so.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

New York City exempted the tax on clothing and footwear as did Suffolk and the downstate region, what other downstate counties, do you recall?

MR. POLLERT:

I don't know which other ones, but I'll be happy to get the chart which is in my office. I do have the chart.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Because one might assume that had not New York City done so, that we have received in our shopping centers and outlets a large influx of city residents who would be attracted to Suffolk shopping centers and outlets for avoiding the tax on clothing and footwear. But clearly if New York City has it in place, New Jersey has always had it in place, you know, where are always these residents -- where are all these shoppers coming from, Nassau County?

MR. POLLERT:

When we contacted Tanger a while ago, it was partly their belief, I'm not sure to the extent that they want to discuss internal numbers, but it was partly their belief that they are attracting people from New York who come out because it's an outlet, not just because it's sales tax free, but the fact that they feel that they can get a better buy because it's an outlet store.

5

---

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

I would think on Wall Street the analysts keep track of same store sales for large outlet stores, is there anyway we can get that information? Is that information available on the web?

MR. POLLERT:

Frankly, that's an interesting question. The data which is reported is for stores in general. The companies keep proprietary what the individual store results are. Likewise, we had requested data from New York State Sales Tax, they had told us that because it's proprietary data, they couldn't share that with either the County Executive's Office or the County Legislature, but if the Comptrollers Office made a very specific request with respect to sales tax by category, they would be able to provide that to the Comptroller Office as long as that data did not identify a particular type of vendor. They are clearly concerned that if they would identify what sales tax data was for a Sears that would provide a competitive advantage to Sear's competitors.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

That's understandable. So who has to make that request?

MR. POLLERT:

The Comptroller's Office.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

County or State Comptroller.

MR. POLLERT:

The County Comptroller's Office.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Could we request that the County Comptroller do that? I mean, we have another four and a half weeks before we adopt the budget. It would be nice to know that a number that large is a reliable number, so that no one a year from now is sitting here trying to find 20 or \$30 million

in revenue that wasn't materialized -- that didn't materialized.

MR. POLLERT:

Clearly, it is a major revenue, the reasonableness of the forecast. If it's unreasonable or if the numbers were reported to the State of New York were inflated would create a tremendous problem in the middle of the year.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

And it would be a good budgetary practice on our part to just go along with something like that. All right. That said, we'll get to today's agenda unless there are any presentations. Are there any questions for Mr. Pollert or Mr. Knappe?

LEG. BISHOP:

I'll ask a question. It is possible that our original estimate of the sales tax on clothing cost to the Treasury was too low? Could that be -- because intuitively it just doesn't make sense that it was estimated to be what, 30 million three years ago, and now we're saying it's 60 million. I don't think that folks are buying twice as much

6

---

clothing as they used to be.

MR. POLLERT:

Well, now that Ken Weiss has retired, I can speak for Ken. Ken Weiss always maintained that the --

LEG. BISHOP:

He's still here.

MR. POLLERT:

Well, at least he's no longer a County employee. Ken had always maintained that the estimates were too low. We felt that the estimates were accurate based upon the methodology that we had used at that point in time, and we felt that it was validated by the numbers reported to the State of New York. So the long and the short of it is we felt that the numbers were accurate when we had made the forecast of the 30 to \$35 million. And I'm not sure why it has grown that dramatically.

LEG. BISHOP:

I know at the time you thought they were accurate.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. Even in retrospect I think they were accurate.

LEG. BISHOP:

So then you think that twice as much clothing is being purchased.

MR. POLLERT:

That's what's being reported to the State of New York. That is the best -- that is the best data which we have. Our numbers are lower on the forecast than the County Executive's Office. So the County Executive's Office has estimated \$58.2 million. We're closer in the range, and we will be updating our forecast with the October quarterly sales tax, but we're closer in the range between 50 to \$55 million. We're more comfortable in that range than at the 58.2. And that would be a reasonable for not unexplainable growth from \$35 million up to



\$50 million.

LEG. BISHOP:

That's 40% percent growth, 45% growth at a time when the economy is gradually contracting or at least stabilizing, you know. Something's, you know, something's not right.

MR. POLLERT:

Clothing sales are relatively an elastic.

LEG. BISHOP:

Dismal science is failing us. I'm sorry.

MR. POLLERT:

The sales tax on clothing is relatively an elastic, so that you find that individuals tend to buy the clothing if it's less than \$110. It's not like it's a purchase of mink coat, which is a discretionary expense, it's more of a required expense. So I would imagine that --

7

---

LEG. BISHOP:

That would have bolstered my argument that's something's not right, right? I don't think what to say, but it's difficult to make policy when you have such crazy variations.

MR. SABATINO:

Does the data show whether people were attracted to come into Suffolk County?

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

You mean the advertising campaign, is that what you're getting at?

LEG. CRECCA:

Well, I actually had a question on that line there. And if I may Legislator Bishop and Mr. Chairman. And I will follow up the thought of able Counsel, but it is possibly, I mean, obviously -- now I sound like an attorney -- but, you know, it is possible that this -- this massive growth in clothing sales was a result of the fact that we had people coming from out of county by much larger numbers to buy clothes here. Therefore, the reporting's up, and that they are real coming here for the tax-free savings?

LEG. BISHOP:

You would see a decline in Nassau County then, right?

LEG. CRECCA:

Well, have we looked at Nassau's numbers?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes. Just in general, we've tracked Nassau County's numbers. Part of the difficulty is last year Nassau County was growing better than Suffolk County. If you included and threw back in what we had lost on the sales tax on clothing, then our growth would have been higher than Nassau County's. So it's difficult to compare the two, because if you have individuals coming to Suffolk County to purchase a lot of tax free clothing, it's nontaxable, so we have no idea outside of what's being reported to the State of New York if we're being mobbed with people coming from Nassau County. It doesn't show up.

LEG. CRECCA:

Okay. But -- I guess maybe I didn't understand the answer.

LEG. BISHOP:

It's an unlikely scenario.

MR. POLLERT:

It doesn't show up because of nontaxable. So if somebody came from Nassau County to buy \$2000 worth of tax-free clothing, it doesn't show up, so --

LEG. CRECCA:

No. But -- but then you have to -- if somebody is coming from Nassau, and I didn't necessarily say from Nassau, they could be coming from the City, they could be coming from the --

8

---

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

The City -- the City is exempt. They have the exemption in the City.

LEG. CRECCA:

I know, but with the outlets and stuff too they were going to Pennsylvania theoretically, but I don't know. Well, I mean -- but the thing is we don't know if Nassau -- we don't -- they don't single out clothing as a separate item in Nassau?

MR. POLLERT:

They do, but they don't break it down less than \$110. I have the reporting form --

LEG. CRECCA:

Let's assume that almost -- that all the clothes sold in Nassau are less than \$110. I mean, would -- would these numbers jive out? In other words, have they shown a decline in clothing sales or an increase in clothing sales?

MR. POLLERT:

We don't monitor their sales tax down to that level. We just look at the aggregate amount of sales tax and compare it to Nassau County.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Well, then I think -- then I think what Andrew is asking is a good question. Is -- could you take a look at a line item by line item breakdown to see if there would, let's say, be a difference of 15 or \$20 million in the loss of clothing sales in Nassau County, sales tax receipts. Because then one might reasonably make an assumption that we have been the beneficiary of the lion's share of that.

MR. POLLERT:

Clearly what we're doing as part of our Budget Review is that we're going to be investigating significant amounts of resources in looking at the accuracy of this forecast, because this it is so important to the Operating Budget, but we haven't completed it yet. So quite a few of the questions that you're asking, hopefully I will have an answer by the time the Operating budget report comes out. So we're attempting to -- to check and to validate by whatever means possible how accurate that \$58 million estimate is.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:



For 2002, based on the last memo I have seen from your office, you anticipate there will be a slight surplus --

MR. POLLERT:  
That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Those two or \$3 million in sales collection in Suffolk?

MR. POLLERT:  
That's correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Okay. So for this year we just about when you consider the size of

9

---

\$852 million that they collected in sales tax receipts, that's pretty much right on -- on the mark.

MR. POLLERT:  
That is correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
So with the inclusion of \$58.2 million in the proposed budget, we are now projecting that in 2003 the sales tax collections would be somewhere in the area of about \$910 million? Nine hundred, 910, somewhere in that range?

MR. POLLERT:  
Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Okay. Are you comfortable with that?

MR. POLLERT:  
The County Executive's Office has forecast a 3.57% growth in sales tax. The last memo that we provided to the Legislature was that we were forecasting about 3.5% growth. So his estimate is slightly higher than what we had estimated, and it's slightly higher than what their internal consultant had estimated as well. So we're waiting until the October quarterly numbers come out to find out whether or not the Budget Review Office model should be moved off that 3.5% growth. If we stay with 3.5% growth, then the sales tax estimates included by the County Executive's Office would be in the neighborhood of about, it's my recollection, about \$12 million higher than what we're forecasting between sales tax on the clothing together with the base growth.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Ten million dollars higher.

MR. POLLERT:  
That's correct. That's my recollection.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
At what point does either office factor in the broader trends that are taking place in the national and regional economy when week after week now there's been very negative reaction to markets in general and in particular consumer confidence as measured by the Michigan --

University of Michigan index and others consistently has declined? And as recently as yesterday another index of consumer confidence came down below 50, and anything below 50 is considered that the economy is in contraction. Do we look at those things? Do we feel we're immune from those national and regional trends that they are not going to catch up with us in the next 12 to 18 months?

MR. POLLERT:

What I would do is I would like to defer to Robert on the details. We do specifically use the University of Michigan Risk Analysis, which we contract for through the Community College. That's what we factor in with respect to our forecasts. We also have a computer model which factors in the unemployment rate and the employment rate, and we tends

10

---

to use consensus forecasts for what we're anticipating with respect to the unemployment and the employment rates. There's a local input output model which we employee to try to bring it down to the regional level. So to the extent possible, yes, we try to take that into account. Clearly, the econometric model which we use uses four or five different variables which goes into the forecast; one of the variables is what's called a dummy variable which explains previous variances. There's been a tremendous amount of noise in sales tax with respect to what happened with September 11th, and the fact that we didn't get the third and fourth quarter or even the first quarter sales tax on a clean type of basis. So cleaning up the data has been very time consuming on Robert's part, but at this point in time we feel that we have as clean a data as possible. And we try to take those long term forecasts into account.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay. I mean again, when we look back to the '87 recession, national recession, it didn't really hit us locally for some two and a half, three years later, but eventually, you know, things even out. So I think at some point we have to factor in adjustments because we're not immune to them or are we? Are we?

MR. POLLERT:

We tend to be -- more recent evidence has indicated that we're relatively immune on the sales tax side, but not the expenditure side. Our caseload in the Department of Social Services is tracking up very quickly in response to a soft economy, sales tax hasn't bottomed out accordingly. So our expenses are going up rather dramatically in those areas, however, the sales tax revenues have is not declined to an extent that we would have anticipated.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Now, at the national level the Congress has just extended the Welfare Reform Measure, what -- what are the particulars on that, and is there any potential for adverse impact over the next 12 months as a result of federal action or inaction or reform or change that may take place?

MR. POLLERT:

Yesterday the analyst in charge of the Department of Social Services and Gail Vizzini went out to talk to the Medicaid Unit in Social Services, they have some concerns other long term trends. I know they're going to -- to two or three other units that will also be impacted by the Welfare Reform. And I can't tell you at this point in time. But I would be happy --

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Will we have -- will we have a better idea before we adopt the budget?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, you will.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay. And you will reflect that in your Budget Review Report?

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, we are. Part of what we are doing is keeping track. I just

11

---

heard from Ray Bennardo in the County Executive's Office with respect to coming up with a consolidated worksheet between the Budget Review Office and the County Executive's Office with respect to what the impact of the state and federal mandates are. The Budget Review Office has already issued a report to a few Legislators that had requested it, and when we get the updated data, it's my intent to provide it to all of the Legislators.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay. We'll continue this conversation during the Budget Hearings, and we'll look forward to that information as well. Okay. We'll go to today's agenda. If Legislator Cooper could be kind enough to return.

#### TABLED RESOLUTIONS PRIME

(P) 1568-2002. Requiring child product recall notification at childcare facilities. (CRECCA)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

We have IR 1568, is there a motion? Motion to table by --

LEG. CRECCA:

I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

-- Legislator Bishop, seconded by Legislator Crecca. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. TABLED (VOTE:4-0-0-0)

(P) 1587-2002. Amending the 2002 Operating Budget transferring funds for the New York State Fishing and Tackle Trade Association. (TOWLE)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

1587, same motion, same second, same vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. TABLED (VOTE:4-0-0-0)

And cast Legislator Cooper's vote with the majority.

LEG. COOPER:

Thank you.

(P) 1590-2002. Amending the 2002 Operating Budget transferring positions from the Department of Public Works to the Police Department. (POSTAL)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

1590, same motion, same second, same vote. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

#### INTRODUCTORY PRIME

(P) 1991-2002. Transferring contingent funding for various contract agencies. (PRES. OFFICER)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

We now go to page two and Introductory Resolution 1991. Explanation, Counsel.

12

---

MR. SABATINO:

1991 and 2022 have an overlap. So this is picking up programmatic funding from the Legislative account for those Legislators who didn't make Phase I and Phase II. It's just that 2022, I think, is the broader of them.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

So we should consider 2022.

MR. SABATINO:

You can consider them at the same time, I'm just trying to -- okay. The problem is see 1991 is 25,000, but 2022 is 39,000 because it's more encompassing. So if you want to do --

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Table 1990 --

MR. SABATINO:

-- the big picture, I would say get 1991 out of the way.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

1991 should be considered.

MR. SABATINO:

Like tabled subject to call and consider 2022 instead, which is the --

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

2022 includes everything that was in 1991.

MR. SABATINO:

Everything that was in 1991 plus some catch fills.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay. So I'll make a motion to table subject to call, 1991, seconded by Legislator Cooper. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous. TABLED SUBJECT TO CALL (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

For the sake of consistency, we'll jump to 2022.

(P) 1991-2002. Transferring contingent funding for various contract agencies. (PHASE III) (PRES. OFFICER)

Are there any questions? Hearing none, we have a motion by Legislator Bishop, seconded by the Chair. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1992-2002. Amending the 2002 adopted Operating Budget and appropriating funds for the Vocational Education and Extension Board (VEEB). (HALEY)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Motion to table.

LEG. CRECCA:  
Second.

13

---

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Motion and second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
Unanimous. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1993-2002 Amending the 2002 adopted Operating Budget and appropriating funds for the Police Athletic League. (HALEY)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
1993, same motion, same second, same vote. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1994-2002. Amending the 2002 adopted Operating Budget and appropriating funds for the North Shore Youth Council. (HALEY)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
1994, same motion, same second, same vote. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1995-2002. Amending the 2002 adopted Operating Budget and appropriating funds for The Nature Conservancy. (HALEY)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
1995, same motion, same second, same vote. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1996-2002. Amending the 2002 adopted Operating Budget and appropriating funds for Mather Hospital Fortunato Breast Cancer Center. (HALEY)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
1996, same motion, same second, same vote. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1997-2002. Amending the 2002 adopted Operating Budget and appropriating funds for the Lifeline Meditation Center. (HALEY)

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
1997, same motion, same second, same vote. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

(P) 1998-2002. Amending the adopted 2002 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with Suffolk County Planning Federation for Smart Growth Policy Plan Training. (FIELDS)

MR. SABATINO:  
This is -- this is for the reimbursement of training of Town and Village Zoning Planning Boards requested by Planning as a follow up to the funding that was done a year ago as one of the Smart Growth recommendations.

LEG. BISHOP:  
Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Motion to table, is there a second?

LEG. CRECCA:  
Second.

14

---

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
All in favor? Opposed? I'm opposed. It's TABLED. (VOTE: 3-1-0-0)  
(Opposed; Leg. Caracciolo)

(P) Amending the 2002 Operating Budget transferring funds for the  
installation of flagpoles at various health centers. (TOWLE)

LEG. CRECCA:  
Motion to table 2017.

LEG. COOPER:  
Second.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Motion and second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
Unanimous. TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

LEG. CRECCA:  
Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion to adjourn this meeting.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:  
Motion is acknowledged, second is acknowledged, we stand adjourned.

(\*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 2:30 P.M.\*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY

15